

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor, JOURNAL OF THE EUGENICS EDUCATION SOCIETY.
Sir,

One important conclusion which I think must be drawn from Dr. Gibbons' paper in your issue of July, but which appears to have been overlooked by the Conference, is the astounding disgenic effect in itself of the curing of venereal diseases. For unless these are more common in the upper than in the lower classes (and I imagine the truth is very much the other way about) it is clear that Syphilis by rendering women sterile, and Gonorrhea by doing the same to men, act eugenically in reducing the descendants of the more foolish and less provident (fore-seeing) members of the community. This does not mean that we are to deprecate advance in medical discovery, but it does emphasise the urgent necessity of countering its disgenic effect in enabling weak and unhealthy people to propagate their kind by adopting every means possible to bring home to the ignorant, and the very poor and the feckless the ease and personal advantage to themselves of contraception, with the ideal for most of them of no children at all. The present lack of houses and of employment affords indeed a pertinent text.

At the same time an equally intensive campaign is clearly now required to induce those who can bring up a healthy family to do so. I was told, a little while ago, of one of our greatest public schools that among its old boys who fell in the war were 200 only-sons—that is to say in respect of this school alone 200 of our best families had hung their chance of continuance on the slender threads of one male life, which had now gone, and probably on the average less than one other. This from the national point of view is of course all wrong. The wise words of our President in his address on the "Future of our Race" need to be brought home to all educated and well-to-do parents. So much is heard now-a-days of the dangers of an increase in our numbers that it has come to be considered foolish for even a thoroughly healthy and able stock to have a family of more than three, and the great importance of breeding from our better strains is overlooked. There is probably no more important problem before England to-day than the substitution of its C. population by a mixture of A and B, but with a sufficiently intensive campaign the improvement in the course of one generation only, might be immense.

P. F. FYSON.

To the Editor,
Sir,

Mr. Perry, in your issue of July, after quoting instances to show that in the past advance in culture has usually been due to immigration of a more advanced people, and has disappeared with its dying out or departure, goes back completely in his last paragraph on the obvious conclusions, and on the teachings as I understand them of his "Children of the Sun" to argue that to-day with the wide diffusion of knowledge through printing, culture will survive independent of the people who made it. But a detail, like the change in the mode of communication of thought from the spoken to the written word, cannot upset a great principle if it be true; and Mr. Perry if he will look around may easily find to-day abundant evidence of the truth he was at such pains originally to establish in his "Children of the Sun." He need only look a few hundred miles to the West or to the East. The difference in culture attained by the Irish in the South of Ireland and the descendants of the immigrant Scotch in the North, or by the Danes in a country less kindly endowed by nature, are examples of a truth of which indeed none who have ever travelled and seen other civilisations can have the least doubt.

P. F. FYSON.

Sir,

Prof. Goodrich's review of my book is what I should expect from an old and valued friend and a scientific opponent. I have nothing whatever to complain of in its tone: my only reasons for commenting on it are first, that Prof. Goodrich has in one or two points misunderstood me and so, unintentionally no doubt, misrepresented me, and secondly, that the serious points on which we differ are in my